

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/723,430	11/25/2003	Neil Young	021755-000300US	6240	
20350	20350 7590 02/28/2006			EXAMINER	
	D AND TOWNSEND A	ZIMMERMA	ZIMMERMAN, BRIAN A		
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			2635		
			DATE MAILED: 02/28/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/723,430	YOUNG ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Brian A. Zimmerman	2635			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status			·			
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
,		_ action is non-final.				
•—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
,	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	г.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected to by the E	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
	e of References Cited (P1O-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te			
3) X Inform	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/3/05</u> .		atent Application (PTO-152)			

ņ

Art Unit: 2635

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

e) the invention was described in — (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language;

1. Claims 1,3,4,9,10,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Nagata (6970096).

Nagata shows a method for communicating to a model vehicle to program the model vehicle and then provide control signals to the model vehicle. The system of Nagata includes a control device 2 that communicates with a first device (train 1) when the first device is located near the control device; actually the first device is placed within the recess 21d of the control device. This narrow IR transmission (LED 23) is used to program the first device for future communication using a second communication link from LED 22 on the opposite side of the controller. There is also a barrier around the LED 23.

Art Unit: 2635

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 2,5-8,11-17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagata as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Borgstahl (5909183).

In an analogous art, Borgstahl also teaches a remote control system where the controller and the controlled object are programmed to be associated with each other prior to the signaling to control the object. Borgstahl teaches though, the object being controlled sends a signal to the controller such that the controller can learn the identity and features of the controlled object, thereby allowing the controller to access the full features of the object being controlled. Using a bi-directional link would require a receiving element near or associated with the transmitting element 23.

Regarding claim 8, the examiner takes official notice that the use of barcode as readable identifier of the train would be verily common since barcodes to identify items is often used in the art.

Regarding claim 17, the examiner takes official notice that the location of the elements is well within the skill of the ordinary artisan. *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950) (Claims to a hydraulic

Art Unit: 2635

power press which read on the prior art except with regard to the position of the starting switch were held unpatentable because shifting the position of the starting switch would not have modified the operation of the device.); *In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975) (the particular placement of a contact in a conductivity measuring device was held to be an obvious matter of design choice).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a bi-directional link for programming the train of Nagata since this would expand the control capabilities for complex trains while also requiring less memory and processing power in the actual train itself since more intelligence would be in the controller as suggested by Borgstahl.

3. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagata and Borgstahl (5909183) as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Young (5749547).

In an analogous art, Young teaches the communication of commands to the train units being over the train tracks. This provides the ability to control the trains as long as they are connected to the track even when the train may be in a tunnel and be out of sight.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the train tracks to communicate commands over the tracks as taught by Young, since this would ensure communication to trains on the track.

Art Unit: 2635

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian A. Zimmerman whose telephone number is 571-272-3059. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 am to 4 pm E.S.T.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Horabik can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BAZ